



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:

Chudzik et al.

Serial No. 09/901,425

Filed: 9 July 2001

For: MEDICAMENT INCORPORATION
MATRIX

To: Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

) Art Unit: 1617

)

) Our Ref. 9896.139.3

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

distinct or independent inventions. M.P.E.P. § 803. The subject matter of Groups I and II are quite sufficiently related that a thorough search for the subject matter of any one group would encompass a search for the subject matter of both groups. To avoid duplicative examination by the Patent Office and unnecessary delay and expense to Applicant, Applicant respectfully requests examination on the merits of all the claims, not just those of Group II.


It would appear that the various election of species requirements specify and apply only to claims within non-elected Group I, hence no election of species appears to be required.

Nevertheless, Applicant would traverse the election of species requirement as well. In particular, MPEP 802.02 clearly provides that an election of species requirement is merely a type of restriction requirement. As such, the present Office Actions fails to meet *either* of the two fundamental requirements of *any* restriction requirement, as set forth in MPEP 808, namely, that it provide: (1) reasons why the inventions *as claimed* are either independent or distinct, *and* (2) reasons for insisting on restriction therebetween. Accordingly, the election of species requirement fails to meet the Office's own standards and should be withdrawn. Moreover, the rules (37 CFR 1.141) provide that a reasonable number of species may be included in a single application, where, as here, other conditions are met.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional filing fees required to Deposit Account No. 061910. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: 22 NOV 2082

Respectfully submitted,


Philip M. Goldman
Registration No. 31,162
Fredrikson & Byron, P.A.
4000 Pillsbury Center
200 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1425